UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/001,435	10/31/2001	Min Zhu	M-11960 US	2352

7590 06/06/2005

PHILIP W. WOO
SIDLEY AUSTIN BROWN & WOOD LLP
555 CALIFORNIA STREET
SUITE 5000
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104-1715

EXAMINER
DIVECHA, KAMAL B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2151	

DATE MAILED: 06/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/001,435	ZHU ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	KAMAL B. DIVECHA	2151	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>02 May 2005</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
  closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-27</u> is/are pending in the application.

  4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>5 and 15</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-4,6-14 and 16-27</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>10/31/2001</u> is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

  Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

  Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

  a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

    1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

    2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

    3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
      application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

Response to Arguments

Claims 1-4, 6-14 and 16-27 are pending in this Office Action.

Applicant has canceled claims 5 and 15.

Applicant has added new claims 21-27.

The objections made with respect to drawings remains objected.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-4, 6-14 and 16-27 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance as per applicant requests.

Drawings

1.   The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the limitations disclosed in claims 2-10 and 12-20 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement

Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the

drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified

and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the

drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the

claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various

claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any

evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out

the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later

invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c)

and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

1.   Claims 1-3, 6-7, 10-13, 16-17, 20-23 and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Slaughter, III et al. (hereinafter Slaughter, U. S. Patent No. 5,598,536) in

view of Loveland (U. S. Patent No. 6,782,413 B1).

As per claim 1, Slaughter discloses a method comprising steps of: receiving a request

(read as an attempt to gain access to the network by entering a user identification string) to

access a target computer (read as a computer on a network) from a remote computer (fig. 1 item

#12) at a central computer system (read as central remote access server, fig. 1 item #28) (col. 3

L19-25 and L50-52; fig. 3 item #56); determining whether the remote computer has permission

to access the target computer (read as authentication process, col. 3 L52-55; fig. 3 item #57); and

allowing the remote computer to access the target computer if the remote computer has

permission to access (read as remote user is authenticated to access network) the target computer

(read as a computer on a network, col. 3 L56-60; fig. 3 item #58), wherein determining

comprises: receiving at the central computer system the numeric identification code from the

user (col. 3 L50-52; col. 8 L45-48); and allowing the remote computer to access the target

computer (col. 4 L11-18; col. 8 L60-62), however, Slaughter does not explicitly disclose the

process of accessing a stored telephone number from the target computer; dialing the telephone

number to call a user at the remote computer; comparing the numeric identification code to a

stored numeric identification code and allowing the remote computer to access the target

computer if the received numeric identification code matches the stored identification code.

Loveland, from the same field of endeavor, explicitly discloses the process of dialing a

clients telephone number that is retrieved by the manager (read as accessing a stored telephone

number and dialing the telephone number to call user, col. 16 L6-15); receiving at the

communication server the user's identification (read as a numeric identification code, col. 20 L6-

12; fig. 8 item #606); comparing the numeric identification code to a stored numeric

identification code (col. 20 L42-44; col. 19 L65-67; fig. 8 item #610); and allowing the remote

computer to access the target computer if the received numeric identification code matches the

stored identification code (col. 19 L65-67; fig. 8 item #614 and 616). Therefore, it would have

been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to

incorporate the teaching of Loveland as stated above with Slaughter in order to determine

whether the remote computer has permission to access the target computer.

One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated so that the user is identified

and authenticated for accessing the data and other resources available to the user via

communication server and reduce the system's vulnerability to imposter attacks (Loveland, col.

19 L60 to col. 20 L48).

As per claim 2, Slaughter discloses the process of allowing the remote computer to access

all of the applications that are located on the target computer if the remote computer has

permission to access the target computer (col. 4 L11-18; col. 6 L50-51).

As per claim 3, Slaughter discloses the process wherein a remote computer is first

authenticated, allowed access to network and authorized access to specific network services

available on a server if the remote computer has permission to access the network computer

and/or services (read as allowing a remote computer to access only some of the applications

available on a target computer or server, fig. 3 step #57, 58 and 64; col. 6 L50-54).

As per claim 6, Slaughter does not explicitly disclose the process of allowing the remote

computer to access an application on the target computer while the remote computer is

participating in a data conference (read as the process of sending and receiving data or the

process of communicating). Loveland discloses the process of multiple modes of access by users

to applications and the resources (read as the process where the user can utilize different

applications such as instant messaging, videoconferencing, etc., at the same time, col. 15 L21 to

col. 16 L52 and col. 13 L55 to col. 14 L6 and fig. 5). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a

person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Loveland in

order to allow a remote user to access an application on the target computer while engaging in a

data conference. One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because it would

have allowed a user to utilize the resources available simultaneously.

As per claim 7, Slaughter discloses the process of allowing the remote computer to

transfer a file from the target computer to the remote computer (col. 5 L12-23).

As per claim 10, Slaughter does not explicitly disclose the process wherein the target

computer stores a username and password and the target computer uses the username and

password to establish a connection with the central computer system. Loveland discloses the

process of storing username and password by a computer and using the username and password

to establish connection with another computer (fig. 7 item #530, fig. 8 item #614 and col. 19 L26

to col. 20 L64 and fig. 2). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled

in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Loveland as stated

above with Slaughter in order to establish a connection with the computer system. One of

ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because username and password

combination are generally used to log an authenticated user onto the system, therefore reducing

the system's vulnerability to imposter attacks (Loveland, col. 19 L55-57 and col. 20 L30-35).

As per claims 11-13, 16-17, 20-23, 25-26, they do not teach or further define over the

limitations in claims 1-3, 6-7, 10. Therefore, claims 11-13, 16-17, 20-23 and 25-26 are rejected

for the same reasons as set forth in claims 1-3, 6-7, 10.

2.   Claims 4, 9, 14, 19 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Slaughter, III et al. (hereinafter Slaughter, U. S. Patent No. 5,598,536) in view of Loveland (U.

S. Patent No. 6,782,413 B1), in further view of King et al (hereinafter King, U. S. Patent No. 5,895,471).

As per claim 4, Slaughter in view of Loveland does not explicitly disclose the process of receiving a request to establish a connection from the target computer at the central computer system.

King discloses the process of receiving the request to establish a connection with the appropriate network server (col. 7 L35-37 and fig. 1). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of King as stated above with Slaughter in view of Loveland in order to establish a connection from the target computer.

One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because it would have serviced the remote users request through the established connection (King, col. 7 L35-67).

As per claim 9, Slaughter in view of Loveland does not explicitly disclose the process wherein the target computer (a computer) stores a URL that identifies the central computer system (another computer) and the target computer uses the URL to establish a connection with the central computer system. King discloses the process of storing URL in a server (a computer) and using the URL to establish a connection with another computer (col. 8 L14-30; col. 11 L40-65). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of King as stated above with Slaughter in view of Loveland in order to establish a connection by a computer by using URL of the designated computer. One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because URLs are used to identify and control access to resources on the network (King, see abstract).

As per claim 14, 19 and 24, they do not teach or further define over the limitations in

claims 4 and 9. Therefore, claims 14, 19 and 24 are rejected for the same reasons as set forth in

claims 4 and 9.

3.   Claims 8, 18 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Slaughter,

III et al. (U. S. Patent No. 5,598,536) in view of Loveland (U. S. Patent No. 6,782,413 B1), and

further in view of "Official Notice".

As per claim 8, Slaughter in view of Loveland does not explicitly disclose the process

wherein the remote computer is allowed to print a file that is associated with an application

located on the target computer on a local printer without requiring a local printer driver to be

installed on the target computer, But local printing is obvious and well known in the art. It is well

known and obvious to the person of ordinary skilled in the art that one does not require to install

the local print driver onto the target computer where the resources to be printed resides in order

to print the resources locally. Therefore, Official Notice is taken to indicate that one does not

need to install local printer driver onto the target computer where the applications and/or

resources are located for printing files locally. One of ordinary skilled in the art would have

been motivated because printing a file remotely does not require a local printer driver to be

installed in the target computer because local printers are installed with the right drivers for

printing documents locally.

As per claim 18 and 27, they do not teach or further define over the limitations in claim 8.

Therefore, claims 18 and 27 are rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claim 8.

Additional References

4.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

        a.   Hornbuckle, U. S. Patent No. 5,649,187.

        b.   Hogan et al., U. S. Patent No. 5,778,368.

        c.   Hosbach et al., U. S. Patent No. 5,870,465.

        d.   Staples et al., U. S. Patent No. 5,889,845.

        e.   Barber et al., U. S. Patent No. 6,088,435.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KAMAL B. DIVECHA whose telephone number is 571-272-5863. The examiner can normally be reached on Flex schedule 8 hr days (10.00am-6.30pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Zarni Maung can be reached on 571-272-3939. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

May 26, 2005.

FRANTZ B. JEAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER